



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,674	11/03/2000	Terizhandur S. Ramakrishnan	60.1421	6269

7590 01/20/2004

Intellectual Property Law Department
Schlumberger-Doll Research
Old Quarry Rd
Ridgefield, CT 06877

EXAMINER

GARLAND, STEVEN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2125

DATE MAILED: 01/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/705,674

Applicant(s)

RAMAKRISHNAN ET AL.

Examiner

Steven R Garland

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-12, 15-20, 22-27 and 29-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7, 13, 14, 21, 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 November 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract exceeds the 150 word length limit. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3,8,9,11,15-17,22-24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Streetman 6,456,902.

Streetman discloses remote oil field management using a sensor to supply data to a CPU, programming the CPU and collecting data; coupling the CPU to the Internet or server to allow remote access to the data, partial analysis of the data, determining if an abnormal condition occurs outside of bounds, and generating an alarm.

See the abstract; figures; col. 1, lines 13-22; col. 2, lines 47-57; col. 3, lines 1-37; col. 4, line 22 to col. 6, line 34; col. 8, lines 7-23.

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2125

5. Claims 4-6, 12, 18-20, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Streetman 6,456,902 as applied to claims 1-3,8,9,11,15-17,22-24, and 26 above, and further in view of Ocondi 5,983,164.

Streetman discloses remote oil field management using a sensor to supply data to a CPU, programming the CPU and collecting data; coupling the CPU to the Internet or server to allow remote access to the data, partial analysis of the data, determining if an abnormal condition occurs and generating an alarm.

See the abstract; figures; col. 1, lines 13-22; col. 2, lines 47-57; col. 3, lines 1-37; col. 4, line 22 to col. 6, line 34; col. 8, lines 7-23.

Streetman however does not teach data compression, data trending, correlating or specifically state determining if the data is outside limits.

Ocondi teaches data compression, trending, correlating and the use of limits. See the abstract; figures; col. 1, lines 45-53; col. 3, line 58 to col. 4, line 29; col. 5, line 41 to col. 6, line 28; col. 7, lines 18-40; col. 8, line 18 to col. 10, line 26 on.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Streetman in view of Ocondi and use data compression to reduce the data transmission time and reduce memory requirements. Further it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Streetman in view of Ocondi and use data trending, limits, and correlation for improved data analysis and control functions such as implementing flow control when limits are exceeded.

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2125

7. Claims 8-10,22-25, and 29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 8, line 2, The results “ lacks a proper antecedent basis. Claim 22 has a similar problem.

In claim 29, line 4, “ the active wells “ lacks a proper antecedent basis.

In claim 30, line 4, “ the passive wells “ lacks a proper antecedent basis.

The remaining claims fall with the parent claims.

8. Claims 7, 13,14,21, 28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claims 10, 25,29-35 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Sherwin et al. 2002/0035551 and Robert et al. 6,498,988 are of interest in oil field monitoring.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven R Garland whose telephone number is 703-305-9759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 to 5:00.

Art Unit: 2125

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on 703-308-0538. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-3900.

SRG

Steven R Garland
Examiner
Art Unit 2125

L. P. Picard

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100